

Serial No. 09/875,659
August 18, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated March 19, 2003
Page 4 of 6

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants ADD claims 2-7.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ueno et al. (U.S. 5,166,859). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"A method for producing an electronic part having a plurality of internal electrodes, said method comprising:

laminating a plurality of ceramic green sheets one on top of the other, at least some of the ceramic green sheets having conductive paste on a surface thereof such that **the conductive paste is located between two adjacent ceramic green sheets,**

baking the laminated product to obtain the electronic part, **the contraction ratio of the ceramic material forming the ceramic green sheet being greater than the contraction ratio of the conductive paste."** (emphasis added)

Applicants' claim 1 recites the features of "the conductive paste is located between two adjacent ceramic green sheets" and "the contraction ratio of the ceramic material forming the ceramic green sheet being greater than the contraction ratio of the conductive paste." With the improved features of claim 1, Applicants have been able to provide a method for producing an electronic part which effectively minimizes delamination and the inter-layer peel-off phenomenon (see, for example, the first paragraph on page 4 of the Specification).

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Ueno et al. shows a method for producing an electronic part. However, Ueno et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the contraction ratio of the ceramic material forming the ceramic green sheet being greater than the contraction ratio of the conductive paste" as recited in Applicants' claim 1. The Examiner has referred to lines 35-45 of column 26 of Ueno et al. to support this allegation. However, the portions of Ueno et al. referred to by the Examiner merely state that the contraction ratio of the ceramic material is diff rent from the contraction

Serial No. 09/875,659
August 18, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated March 19, 2003
Page 5 of 6

ratio of the conductive paste, **NOT** the contraction ratio of ceramic material is greater than the contraction ratio of the conductive paste as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

The Examiner has stated in paragraph on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action that "*the ceramic material's contraction ratio is interpreted to be larger*" (emphasis in original). The Examiner is reminded that prior art rejections must be based on evidence. Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 117 (1966). The Examiner is hereby requested to cite a reference in support of his position that it was well known at the time of Applicants' invention to the ceramic material of Ueno et al. had a contraction ratio greater than the contraction ratio of the conductive paste of Ueno et al. If the rejection is based on facts within the personal knowledge of the Examiner, the data should be supported as specifically as possible and the rejection must be supported by an affidavit from the Examiner, which would be subject to contradiction or explanation by affidavit of Applicants or other persons. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ueno et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claim 1 of the present application. Claims 2-7 depend upon claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a TWO-month extension of time, extending to August 19, 2003, the period for response to the Office Action dated March 19, 2003.

Serial No. 09/875,659
August 18, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated March 19, 2003
Page 6 of 6

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 18, 2003



Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 19 2003

GROUP 3700

OFFICIAL